Agency Strategic Planning Session

1. Weakness of how Knowledge Management is currently done at NASA
    - Centers don't trust each other
    - Competition
    - Knowledge=Power, so knowledge is hoarded
    - Money Rules
    - Cultural issue
    - Lack of Agency Policy★
    - Management sees value of KM, but they want it at a discount ★
    - Bureaucratic/esoteric KM vision rather than innovative(?) program focused vision ★
    - No KM leadership vision
    - No KM leadership ★
    - Amiguous scope for KM ★
    - Concept of KM
    - Lack of understanding of KM ★
    - Unstructured data leads to chaos ★
    - Minority "opinions" how to handle ★
    - Data diversity
    - Conflicting inputs- who is right? ★
    - Info overload ★
    - No performance measures ★
    - Knowledge taken out of context (misapplied) ★
    - No process for capture/publishing/organizing ★
    - No clear definition of the results to be achieved
    - Diection
    - No vision
    - Unclear objectives
    - No clear goal of KM (too high level)
    - Say one thing and mean another
    - No KM leadership voice for the Agency
    - Over identification of KM with lessons learned
    - Unclear customer
    - Knowledge not a recognized valued resource
    - Focus on tools
    - People devising solutions for other people- don't know needs
    - No direct feedback/pipeline to academia
    - No effective mechanism to tap retired experts
    - Do not use retirees to best advantage
    - Brain drain
    - Isolated KM systems Center⇔Center and HQ⇔Center
    - Engineers trying to solve organizational problems
    - Fragmented approach

**** Colors denote grouping of post it notes on chart***

- No connection to institutional system HR, Training, EEO
- No connect between management and work force
- No plan to interact with the 87 other KM systems
- Integration
- Very little buy-in from Centers to KM team

2. Barrier to successful KM @ NASA
    - Stove pipes
    - Sensitivity to leadership styles
    - 88 systems ★
        i. Disjointed
        ii. Segmented
    - Driven by individual funding sources (programs)
    - Territorial behavior (Knoweldge=turf)
    - Full cost accounting makes it more difficult to build institutional capabilities and tools and encourages stove piping
    - Who approves my knowledge? ★
    - Lack of peer review (veracity of knowledge)
    - Just another passing phase ★
    - Dragging feet
    - The latest fad (bussword)
    - Time
    - Firewalls (more than computers)
    - People-process, products not integrated ★
    - Dirty laundry (learn more from failure)
    - No agents of change
    - Direction
    - There is not a need or desire to participate
    - Understanding of benefits
    - No clear link to NASA mission
    - Years of experience that KM won't work at NASA
    - KM=$
    - Agency KM team owned by JPL IT
    - No KM champion (KM Officer)
    - No KM governance process
    - Multiple KM tools require unnecessary overhead (e.g. learning curves)
    - Measuring success- metrics
    - How to track and define ROI
    - Integration
    - No rules for KM, exchange data
    - Center competition
    - Centers too competitive
    - Stakeholder incentives not clear
    - Center politics to protect $ and systems
    - Funding process for KM toys

**** Colors denote grouping of post it notes on chart***

- No reward to contribute to the corpus
- Lack of incetivie to the individuals
- No one has time for KM (or another website, meeting, responsibility) we need to integrate KM into how people do their work
- Work force is too busy for KM
- Time constraints
- Government trying to act like business but behave like government agency (i.e. full cost)
- Data collection without distribution and infusion back into the workforce
- Credibility of KM as an initiative
- Lack of Agency-wide training programs
- We capture knowledge at wrong size and slope (LL)
- No focus on brain drain while they're working
- Short term project focus- don't value investing in mentoring
- Access to retirees efficiently

3. Agency implemented mitigation that the Agency can/and needs to do
    - Unified Agency policy
    - Open architecture across Agency
    - Embed KM in existing processes (Champions)
    - Consolidate systems by function (IRIS good example)
    - Practical Agency standards for publishable knowledge
    - "Source" docs as knowledge (don't rewrite)
    - Measure it!
        i. How used
        ii. How often
        iii. Handling of inputs
    - Knowledge sharing as a part of annual performance evaluation
    - Agency implementation of knowledge management needs to be driven by mission office/program office needs
    - Knowledge sharing as a part of subcontract award fee
    - Pep-type survey
    - KM Champions w/high visibility
    - Education on basic KM concepts
    - Need knowledgeable KM experts- don't create "experts" who can't do the job
    - Appoint/hire a CKO (Chief Knowledge Officer)
    - Establish COP governance process
    - Does NASA need a KM champion?
    - Get CIO, OCE and OHR as min on board for KM direction
    - Establish a KM advisory board
    - Single sign-on
    - Maximize use of passive data gathering- pull in:
        i. NASA class codes
        ii. Position description
        iii. Resumes

**** Colors denote grouping of post it notes on chart***

iv. Documents (both current and historical)

- Eliminate multiple unnecessary KM surveys
- Steering committee filter prior to congressional appropriations
- EA system that is robust and perceived as fair
- Get a new name
- User participation in COPs: develop rewards
- Develop KM training programs
- Establish results metrics at a high level for COPs
- Institutional (HR- training-EEO-Education)
- Energize HR to engage for turnkey retiree process
- Address OH use to cover people
- Value the use of retirees

4. How does/can PBMA help with this task
    - Be the networker
    - Trends
    - Analysis
    - Performance plans include KM
    - Project progress reports include KM
    - KM survey (PEP)
    - PBMA success stories
    - Benchmark PBMA against other KM capabilities
    - Develop collaborations with other KM capabilities across Agency
    - Misleading name- change name to something more description and broader in scope than mission assurance
    - Repository
    - Training (consolidate w/SOLAR)
    - Marketing capability
    - More visibility
    - Document PBMA requirements, concept of ops, self assessment, criteria for success
    - All the recommendations for the Agency such as policies, standards, and leadership, should be in PBMA- lead by example
    - PBMA beer bash off-site
    - Share with community of practice
    - Enable users to easily get the information they need
    - Contractor performance evaluation plan
    - Embed KM in the way we do work (stealth under the radar)
    - Make KM a part of the way they do their work
    - Identify KM Champions
    - Propose KM advisory board w/CIO, OCE, OHR and staff w/outside advocates (retirees?)
    - Practice learning behavior during work
    - Develop SLAs for each COP

**** Colors denote grouping of post it notes on chart***

- Daily motivation to go to PBMA-KMS e.g. stockticker (cheap trick but effective)
- Allow users to take “ownership” of the system
- Pilot highlight successes using KM
- Market PBMA at all major agencies
- Push-pull of PBMA created knowledge
- Build relationships with the other KM systems and KM groups
- COP self promotion of public/NASA content to PBMA-KMS
- User requirements drive technological implementations
- EA compliance
- EA shows durability and longevity
- Allows stability and users believe in investing in the system
- Provide PBMA content to university programs “push” sustainability
- Increase face-to-face interaction
- Increase VN capture
- High touch processes
    i. Montoring
    ii. Protégé
- Working to capture retiree “tacit” knowledge

**** Colors denote grouping of post it notes on chart***